

### **Remarks**

The Applicants have added new Claims 18-21. New Claim 18 recites that the film further comprises a cross-linkable compound in the resin layer (d). Support may be found on page 20 of the Applicants' Specification. New Claim 19 recites that the fluorine-containing copolymer contains a fluorine-containing olefin chain with a fluorine content of 30% or more. Support may be found on page 18 of the Applicants' Specification. New Claim 20 recites that the fluoride-containing copolymer contains 20% to 70% of a repeating unit derived from the fluorine-containing olefin compound. Support may be found on page 19 of the Applicants' Specification. Finally, new Claim 21 recites that the fluorine-containing copolymer contains 10% to 70% of a repeating unit derived from the vinyl ether-containing compound. Support may be found on page 19 of the Applicants' Specification. Entry of new Claims 18-21 into the original file is respectfully requested.

Claim 1 has been amended to include the subject matter of Claim 9. Claim 9 has thus been cancelled.

Claims 1-17 stand rejected under 35 USC §103 over the combination of Murata with Oka. The Applicants note with appreciation the Examiner's detailed comments hypothetically applying both references against the claims. The Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection is moot with respect to cancelled Claims 7 and 8. The Applicants respectfully submit that the combination is inapplicable to Claims 1-6 and 9-17 for the reasons as set forth below.

The Applicants note the Examiner's frank acknowledgement that Oka fails to disclose the resin layers having an arithmetic average mean surface roughness Ra ranging from 0.004  $\mu\text{m}$  to 0.020  $\mu\text{m}$  or a haze of less than 3%. The Applicants agree. However, there are further problems with Oka. In that regard, the Applicants note that independent Claim 1 recites a resin layer (d)

containing a fluorine-containing copolymer having a vinyl ether in its principal chain. The Applicants respectfully submit that Oka does not disclose, teach or suggest this. Instead, Oka is limited to a very generalized discussion of an organic material having a low refractive index such as a polymer with a fluorine atom. This discussion may be found in column 13, beginning at line 30. Only two examples of such a polymer with a fluorine atom are given, namely polyvinylidene fluoride and the further addition of a trifluoroethyl acrylate. There is no other discussion with respect to what the polymer with a fluorine atom might be other than with respect to a low refractive index.

The Applicants respectfully submit that this disclosure by Oka is non-enabling with respect to the Applicants' claimed fluorine-containing copolymer having a vinyl ether in its principal chain. In that regard, neither polyvinylidene fluoride nor trifluoroethyl acrylate are copolymers and neither has vinyl ether in a principal chain of the fluorine-containing copolymer. The Applicants note that for a publication to be effective as prior art to be utilized in a rejection, that publication must be enabling. The Applicants respectfully submit that Oka is not enabling with respect to the Applicants' claimed fluorine-containing copolymer having a vinyl ether in its principal chain. Instead, Oka is limited to disclosing a polymer with a fluorine atom generally and polyvinylidene fluoride and trifluoroethyl acrylate. This is non-enabling.

Moreover, the Applicants respectfully submit that Oka is non-enabling with respect to the Applicants' claimed copolymers. There are no copolymers disclosed generally or specifically in Oka. Polyvinylidene fluoride and trifluoroethyl acrylate are not copolymers. They are merely polymers. In fact, Oka specifically recites "a polymer with a fluorine atom." There is no disclosure of a copolymer. Thus, the Applicants respectfully submit that Oka is non-enabling as prior art and may not be used to reject the Applicants' claims with respect to the claimed language of fluorine-containing copolymer having a vinyl ether in its principal chain.

The Applicants respectfully submit that there is another problem. However, in that regard, the Applicants specifically claim a multi-layer film having a reflectance of less than 2%. The rejection states that this is disclosed in column 1, at lines 44-45. The Applicants reproduce the entire sentence that is encompassed by lines 44-45 for the Examiner's convenience:

It is already known that, when incident light perpendicularly enters a thin film, in order for the antireflection film to prevent the reflection of light by 100% and to pass light by 100% therethrough, relationships represented by the equations (1) and (2) should be met (see "Science Library" Physics=9 "Optics," pp. 70-72, 1980, Science Sha Ltd., Japan).

The Applicants first note that this discussion concerns the background and is not directed to the Oka inventive material. Be that as it may, however, this is merely a statement that certain relationships should be met to prevent the reflection of light by 100% and to pass light by 100% therethrough. There is nothing in this brief discussion that shows how this could or would be done. This is merely an isolated discussion of the general concept of reflectance and does not provide teachings to those skilled in the art that would enable one skilled in the art to achieve what the Applicants have actually achieved. Thus, the Applicants respectfully submit that this discussion is also non-enabling and inapplicable.

On the other hand, the actual discussion in Oka with respect to the Oka inventive activities is directed to the refractive index. Although refractive indices can have an impact on reflectance, there is no disclosure in Oka that would enable one skilled in the art to have a reasonable expectation that the Oka films could or would have the claimed reflectance. This is because Oka focuses on refractive index and not on the actual reflectance. Thus, this is yet another reason why Oka is inapplicable.

Oka has further problems as well. Oka fails to disclose the resin layer containing silica particles with a particle size of 0.001  $\mu\text{m}$  to 0.2  $\mu\text{m}$ . Instead, Oka discloses the silica particles

that are added into the antiglare layer and antiglare layer is an internal layer. So, the difference is apparent between Claim 1 and Oka.

Oka is directed to a multilayer film comprising a film, an antiglare layer, and a low refractive index layer. The antiglare layer is an internal layer and has a fine uneven surface. Thus, if the external layer (low refractive index layer) contains silica particles with a particle size of 0.001  $\mu\text{m}$  to 0.2  $\mu\text{m}$ , the Ra of external layer (low refractive index layer) exceeds 0.020  $\mu\text{m}$ . Therefore, one skilled in the art would not derive the subject matter of Claim 1 from Oka.

As a consequence, even if one skilled in the art were to take the teachings of Murata and combine them with Oka, the multi-layered films produced from that combination would still not result in what the Applicants claim, namely a fluorine-containing copolymer having a vinyl ether in its principal chain and silica particles with a particle size of 0.001  $\mu\text{m}$  to 0.2  $\mu\text{m}$  or a multi-layer film having a reflectance of less than 2%. That is because even when combined, Murata does not disclose the deficiencies of Oka as set forth above with respect to the copolymer, the vinyl ether in its principal chain, the silica particles and the reflectance of less than 2%. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

In light of the foregoing, the Applicants respectfully submit that the entire Application is now in condition for allowance, which is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



T. Daniel Christenbury  
Reg. No. 31,750  
Attorney for Applicants

TDC/vp  
(215) 656-3381